UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/721,658	11/25/2003	Patrick O'Neill	14318US02	5651	
	7590 09/25/200 S HELD & MALLOY,	EXAMINER			
500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661			, YAARY, MICHAEL D		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2193		
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/25/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		658	O'NEILL ET AL.			
		er	Art Unit			
		Yaary	2193			
The MAILING DATE of this com Period for Reply	munication appears on t	he cover sheet with	the correspondence add	dress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Extensions of time may be available under the provafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this If NO period for reply is specified above, the maxim Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704	E MAILING DATE OF I sions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no communication.  Immunication will apply and reply will, by statute, cause the a nths after the mailing date of this	THIS COMMUNICA event, however, may a repl will expire SIX (6) MONTH pplication to become ABAN	ATION.  ly be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this condoned (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,		
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s	) filed on <u>06/22/2007</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL.	2b) ☐ This action is	non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in ( 4a) Of the above claim(s)  5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,6 and 17-20</u> is/are  7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>3-5 and 7-16</u> is/are obj  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to re	is/are withdrawn from o rejected. ected to.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to b	y the Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any	- · ·	•	* *			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) inclu 11) The oath or declaration is object			·			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a cl a) All b) Some * c) None of 1. Certified copies of the price 2. Certified copies of the price 3. Copies of the certified copies of the price and copies of the certified copies of the price and copies of the certified copies of the certified copies of the price and copies of the certified copies of the cert	of: prity documents have be prity documents have be pies of the priority docur national Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in App ments have been re ule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s)  1)   Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) 🔲 Interview Sur	mmary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Preferences Cried (P10-692)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Reviews  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/l	Mail Date ormal Patent Application			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 6,17, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kulkarni et al. (hereafter Kulkarni)(US Pat. 6,775,423) in view of Chen et al. (hereafter Chen)(US Pat. 6,823,432).
- 4. **As to claim 1,** Kulkarni discloses a system for generating difference information between a first binary image of an electronic device and a second binary image of the electronic device (abstract), the system comprising:

The difference information transmitted to and processed by the electronic device to update memory in the electronic device (column 2, lines 35-39 and column 5, lines 51-59).

Application/Control Number: 10/721,658

**Art Unit: 2193** 

5. Kulkarni does not disclose a bank order determination unit adapted to employ at least one differential evolution technique to determine a bank order of updating device memory comprising a plurality of banks; and the determined bank order transmitted to and processed by the electronic device to update memory in the electronic device.

Page 3

However, Chen discloses a bank order determination unit adapted to employ at least one differential evolution technique to determine a bank order of updating device memory comprising a plurality of banks; and the determined bank order transmitted to and processed by the electronic device to update memory in the electronic device (Abstract and column 2, lines 11-51 disclose an analogous art where memory banks are sorted and balanced, thus ordered, in a system in order to maximize usage of the memory. Therefore, this system may be implemented in the system of Kulkarni. Chen does not explicitly teach using a differential evolution technique to determine a bank order. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use this technique, or to choose among other well-known ordering techniques, such as a shift, bubbles, or nodes technique, to achieve the same result of an ordered memory bank.).

6. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kulkarni, by implementing memory bank ordering, as taught in Chen, for the benefit of maximizing memory usage in the updating system without the risk of filling one particular memory bank to capacity.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,658 Page 4

Art Unit: 2193

7. **As to claim 2,** the combination of Kulkarni and Chen disclose wherein the first binary image and the second binary image comprise at least one of firmware and software in memory banks of the electronic device (Kulkarni column 2, lines 46-67) and the bank order determination unit being adapted to employ genomes to represent bank orders of memory banks of the electronic device (Chen column 2, lines 11-38).

- 8. **As to claims 6, 17, and 18,** the claims are rejected for the same rationale as claim 1 above.
- 9. **As to claim 21,** the combination of Kulkarni and Chen disclose incorporating information in a generated update package facilitating fault tolerant update in a mobile handset receiving the generated update package (Examiner is taking official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the well-known knowledge of fault tolerance in the system in order to allow for the electronic device to have continuous functionality while having failure of a component.).
- 10. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kulkarni in view of Cheng as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Waldin et al. (hereafter Waldin)(US Pat. 6,651,249).
- 11. Waldin was cited in the previous office action dated 03/22/2007.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,658

Art Unit: 2193

Page 5

12. **As to claims 19 and 20**, Kulkarni and Cheng do not disclose incorporating verification information in a generated update package facilitating integrity checking in a mobile handset receiving the generated update package and incorporating authentication information in a generated update package facilitating authentication of a source of the generated update package in a mobile handset receiving the generated update package.

However, Waldin discloses incorporating verification information in a generated update package facilitating integrity checking in a mobile handset receiving the generated update package (column 10, lines 6-11) and incorporating authentication information in a generated update package facilitating authentication of a source of the generated update package in a mobile handset receiving the generated update package (column 4, lines 48-54).

13. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kulkarni and Chen, by incorporating verification information and authentication information, as taught by Waldin, in order to verify stability and that update packages have not been altered.

Art Unit: 2193

# Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claims 3-5 and 7-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/721,658 Page 7

Art Unit: 2193

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Yaary whose telephone number is (571) 270-1249. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MY MY

MENG-ÁL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2424

Application/Control Number: 10/721,658

Art Unit: 2193

Page 8